

of Canada—the discussion of the Union question has been productive of good results. It has opened men's eyes to the unreality, and we must also add the *instability* of our present relations with England. So far as Halifax only is concerned we are comparatively secure, but if we would aid in establishing upon this side of the Atlantic an English nationality sufficiently powerful to hold its own against the possible encroachments of a vastly powerful neighbour, we must be prepared not only to unite with Canada, but likewise to bear the burthen of direct taxation in common with those to whom we now look for support. Canada is even now hesitating between moderate taxation and English good will, and we are in no mood to join our fortunes with hers until we see which way her statesmen will decide. If their decision be in favor of British connection and direct taxation—let us by all means unite for our mutual mercantile advantage. But if Canadian statesmen, failing to obtain what seems to us an unreasonable guarantee so far as England is concerned, are content to "reserve their decision for the present, and see which way the wind blows"—then we say, let the Maritime Provinces enter into the best alliance they can without reference to Canada. We do not think that an Union of the Lower Provinces with Canada would materially increase our power of resistance against an enemy, but we are not blind to the many advantages of Union in a mercantile point of view. We see no reason why Nova Scotia should not become a wealthy manufacturing Country, capable of supporting between two and three millions of people, provided only we have railway communication with a grain producing Country such as Canada—or a portion of Canada. We are rich in coal to an extent scarcely comprehended by those accustomed only to note the coal veins of Great Britain, and our mineral wealth in general is not yet rightly known even to ourselves. The commercial advantages of Union are indeed too obvious to need illustration, and we have, as we formerly remarked, no sympathy whatever with those who would reduce this really momentous question to a matter of taxation as estimated by so many *cents* per head. *The Times* is fully justified in affirming that such arguments "are of the most mercantile character." But, it may be urged that we are inconsistent in advocating an Union with Canada after having persistently opposed the Quebec scheme for many months. We have, we fancy, already explained pretty clearly our motives for distrusting Canada, and as matters now stand, we see no cause for regret in anything we have published against Federation. It has often been urged that the Anti-Federation party has been influenced by personal or party motives, but so far at least as the *Bullfrog* is concerned any such imputation must be regarded as a dull impertinence. We opposed the Quebec scheme for several reasons. (1.) We mistrusted Canada for reasons already set forth. (2.) We thought that any sudden adoption of a scheme which necessitated largely increased taxation, would be resented by those who were called upon to pay for privileges which they could not all at once recognize as advantageous. (3.) We knew that the Delegates did not fairly represent the opinions of the general public.—Having thus set forth the motives which prompted us to oppose the Quebec scheme, we are in duty bound to advocate what seems to us a wiser and a better mode of dealing with a question so important. It is, we fear, pretty evident that mutual distrust must always stand in the way of any compact (however advantageous) arranged by B. N. American statesmen. The history of all congresses about railroads, tariffs, &c., between the Provinces, is a history of agreements repeatedly broken,—a history of constant failures. Nor is this to be wondered at, considering the manner in which our politicians write one of another. So long as our political press continues to educate the public in a thorough contempt for the leading men of either Provincial party, so long will we be unable to carry any measure for the good of all parties. The objections to the Quebec

scheme have been tolerably well sifted, and we trust that the next "Constitution" may be drawn up in London by delegates selected from the ranks of those both for and against the scheme lately rejected. The presence of two or more English statesmen would be highly advantageous, indeed it seems only in accordance with common sense that such should help to frame any bill to be submitted to the British Parliament. A measure thus framed in England could be submitted to the Provincial Legislatures, and if accepted, brought before the British Houses. A Union scheme thus framed would provide largely for defence, regulate the construction of the Intercolonial Railway (not, as matters now stand, to be mentioned in the Imperial Bill), and place the united Provinces upon a firmer basis than can possibly be achieved by any congress of B. American statesmen on this side of the Atlantic. A bill framed in London by a mixed assemblage,—would be above suspicion. A portion of the Anti-Federation press has not scrupled to ascribe to the Quebec delegates motives the reverse of honorable, and to hint pretty strongly at underhand promises of "Governorships," "seats on the Bench," &c., &c. If a Congress such as we have described were to frame an Union Bill in London, we should hear no more about our "Country being sold," and it is just possible Lower Canada might be persuaded into Legislative Union.

RETRENCHMENT.

It is certainly not the fault of the press, if every Nova Scotian who can read, does not know all about Dr. TUPPER's Retrenchment scheme,—indeed, as the *Prov. Secretary* humorously remarked in reply to Mr. ARCHIBALD: "The hon. gentleman "had not considered it necessary to occupy any great length of "time in discussing the Estimate before the House, he * * * "fell back to the three told tale of retrenchment—to that speech "which, as long as he (Dr. T.) had a seat in the House, he "must expect to have annually brought up by gentlemen opposite." This is a somewhat dreary prospect for the reading public, inasmuch as the subject was, to our thinking, exhausted some twelve months ago. The story of retrenchment is indeed so simple that we wonder how the public can care to hear it so often repeated. Prior to the last general election, the financial affairs of the Province, were far from healthy, and retrenchment of some sort was advocated by both parties in the House. The Liberals wanted to raise the tariff—the Conservatives to lower Official salaries. The latter went to the hustings with the cry of Retrenchment, and forthwith came into power. In the course of a year the financial affairs of the Province regained a healthy state, and retrenchment not being needed, was not carried out. The very head and front of Dr. TUPPER's offending, hath this extent—no more. He acted in the matter as every man of common sense on either side of the House would have acted under similar circumstances. Almost every politician goes to the hustings with some popular cry, which it would be highly impolitic to carry out to the letter. Upon this subject an English statesman says: "On the one side, the greater number of representatives consists of those who profess reforms which cannot be "achieved; on the other side, the greater number are those who "the most strenuously denounce the changes which must inevitably take place. To judge by the temper of constituencies, "a compromise would be impossible; the nation must be governed by the opinions which obtain the triumph on the hustings. But, *the election once over*, it is the few temperate men "whose temperance finds small favor at the hustings, who obtain the confidence of the public and the ear of Parliament." There can, we think, be little doubt that nothing short of absolute necessity would justify a reduction in the salaries of our public officers. As it is, they are only just high enough to tempt a man of very moderate means away from his business. If they

were treble what of Assembly met benches; if they wealthy men might honorable ambition calculated to bring if possible. To £700 (currency, politic. Cheap at too dear a price when applied most unwise who tailed expenditure—a comprehensive to taunt a public the necessity for revenue is not fit tuates according control; any attempt laid down twelve months in service of the P order to carry of greater mistake vice, and not at the service of the der, and the bes

Habits of the fine arts, virtues of godliness Baths and The Baths and Church London, Paris, other Roman I clean people forever, be confused rather in a north England and many, France, women of the content with at cause of this p in the English habits of refinement. A cent place in English now considered That so wholes ranks of life idently far re county paper, husband. An nuptial barga place. "D widow's motto though it is desire to avoid advertising for daily immersed the life of her of a bath with this, is not ch it is very sad